



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/089,261	03/26/2002	Gerhard Wieners	99/N007 TPA	2940

7590 03/17/2004

Klaus Schweitzer
ProPat
Crosby Building
2912 Crosby Road
Charlotte, NC 28211

EXAMINER

MCDOWELL, SUZANNE E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1732

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/089,261

Applicant(s)

WIENERS ET AL.

Examiner

Suzanne E. McDowell

Art Unit

1732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 March 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/26/02.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 1732

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 6-9 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from another multiple dependent claim, i.e., claim 4. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-5 provide for the use of a film, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

4. A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74

Art Unit: 1732

(Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 4 recites the broad recitation 5 to 50%, and the claim also recites 1:12 to 5:1 which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

5. Claim 5 recites the limitation "the base layer" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nelson et al. (US Patent 6,210,795). Nelson et al discloses the claimed limitations as follows: making a heat-sealable adhesive label with a substrate film (column 3, lines 50-60), and an adhesive (column 3, line 61-column 4, line 2) which contains spacer particles such as plastic polyethylene particles (column 4, lines 21-30); wherein the layer which touches the container to be molded has a surface roughness of, for example 6.54 micrometers or 7.15 micrometers (Examples 3 and 5) and the label is utilized in an in-mold labeling process (column 2, lines 2-14).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 1732

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson et al. (US Patent 6,210,795) in view of Schumann et al. (US Patent 5,516,563). Nelson et al. teaches the claimed limitations as follows: making a heat-sealable adhesive label with a substrate film (column 3, lines 50-60), and an adhesive (column 3, line 61-column 4, line 2) which contains spacer particles such as plastic polyethylene particles (column 4, lines 21-30); wherein the layer which touches the container to be molded has a surface roughness of, for example 6.54 micrometers or 7.15 micrometers (Examples 3 and 5) and the label is utilized in an in-mold labeling process (column 2, lines 2-14).

Regarding claims 3 and 4, Nelson et al. does not teach that the adhesive layer is formed from polyethylene and polypropylene copolymer, particularly in a weight ratio of 5-50% of PE to PP. Nelson et al. does teach that any adhesive generally may be used (column 3, lines 62-65). Schumann et al. teaches a multilayer film used in a label which has at least one outer layer which is formed from a blend of ethylene and propylene copolymers and a filler (component A) (column 8, lines 38-46) and HDPE (component B) (column 9, lines 49-51) in a ratio of A:B=80:20 to 20:80 (column 11, lines 19-22). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the compositions taught by Schumann et al. to further define the method taught by Nelson et al. in order to form a label with the desired properties, such as reduced blistering and wrinkling, with a good surface appearance.

Regarding claim 5, Nelson et al. does not teach that the base layer is opaque, has vacuole-initiating fillers and a film density of 0.65 to 0.85 g/cm³. Nelson et al. does teach that the base layer may be any materials or layers as known in the art (column 3, lines 50-61). Schumann et al. teaches a multilayer film used in a label which has a base layer with vacuole-inducing solid particles (column 3, lines 52-54), is opaque (column 6, lines 12-17) and has a density of 0.4 to 1.1 g/cm³ (column 7, lines 38-39). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the compositions taught by Schumann et al. to form the layers in the method taught by Nelson et al. in order to form a label with the desired properties, such as reduced blistering and wrinkling, with a good surface appearance.

Art Unit: 1732

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
WO 97/30903.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Suzanne E. McDowell whose telephone number is (571) 272-1205. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael P. Colaianni can be reached on (571) 272-1196. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 272-1700.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SEM
March 6, 2004



SUZANNE E. MCDOWELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER